

REMARKS

This amendment is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination. In reply to the final office action of August 16, 2004, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and following remarks. Claims 1-11, 13-16 and 18-48 are now pending, of which claims 1, 13, 14, 20, 21 and 44 are independent. Claims 1, 13, 14, 20 and 21 are amended by this amendment, and claims 28-48 are added by this amendment. No new matter is believed to be added by this amendment.

Rejection of Claims 1-12, 14 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 8-12, 14, 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertram (U.S. Patent No. 5,818,446) in view of Hoyle (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,010) and "Alexa Internet and Netscape Team To Provide Related Sites To Support Smart Browsing" (hereinafter "Alexa").

As an administrative matter, applicant brings to the Examiner's attention the fact that claims 12 and 17 were cancelled in the response to the previous Office action of December 18, 2003 and was acknowledged as such by the Examiner's disposition of the claims and on page 2 of the Office action of August 18, 2004.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a web browser that, inter alia, adds a new control element to the chrome being displayed while maintaining at least one element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new control element. The new control element is configured in response to the current web site being rendered to invoke functionality related to functionality offered by the current web site being rendered.

The underscored portion of the claim 1 limitation reiterated above represents a limitation added by this amendment, which was naturally not addressed by the Examiner in the Office action. Nevertheless the following is provided to make clear the shortcoming of the combination of Bertram, Hoyle and Alexa with regard to this limitation.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1 because neither Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, nor any combination of the references describes or suggests a web browser program configured to supplement chrome in response to a current web site being rendered with a control element that is configured to invoke functionality related to functionality

offered by the current web site being rendered while maintaining at least one element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new element.

In Bertram, parallel chromes or toolbars are used to accommodate users of differing sophistication. Specifically, in columns 5 and 6, Bertram describes the utility of parallel chromes in various contexts that service users of different sophistication, such as shopping mall kiosks and browser-equipped terminals at the home or throughout an office. See e.g., Bertram at col. 5, line 59 to col. 6, line 21. In one example, Bertram discloses a web page of animals that may be accessed by a child. When displayed, the web page of animals produces appropriate animal sounds. See Bertram at col. 10, lines 1-4. The user interface Bertram provides for a child includes a simplified version of a chrome, whereas the user interface provided for a parent is a correspondingly more complex version of chrome. Compare Bertram Fig. 2 at item 3 (showing a simplified children's version of chrome having four controls depicted as a Capitol building, a car, a printer, and a house, respectively) with Bertram Fig. 3 at item 3 (showing an adult version of chrome having nine controls, each control depicted as graphical icon and text).

By adjusting the complexity of the chrome, Bertram contemplates modifying the appearance of the chrome and changing the control elements displayed in the chrome. More particularly, only pictures are included in a child's chrome of Figure 2 while words are included in an adult chrome of Figure 3. The adult toolbar of Figure 3 includes more control elements than displayed in the child's chrome of Figure 2. Referencing the above-mentioned examples, Bertram explicitly describes various control elements that would be added or removed from a chrome, as follows:

- (1) an address bar is included in the adult toolbar, but not the child's toolbar;
- (2) the adult toolbar includes the ability to invoke multiple concurrent browser instances.

- (3) more complex and numerous choices are offered to adults.

See Bertram at col. 5, lines 33-45 and col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 21.

Yet these examples illustrate that Bertram modifies the user interface with "added" control elements based on the sophistication and requirements of the accessing user, not based on the web destination. As such, the "added" control elements of Bertram are not related to the functionality offered by a web site currently being accessed, as claimed.

Hoyle similarly fails to disclose customizing a chrome with control elements that invoke functionality related to the functionality offered by a web site currently being accessed. Specifically, Hoyle discloses that when the software application is initially installed, the application-icon toolbar is created based on shortcuts existing on the computer's software desktop and thereafter permits the user to manually customize the toolbar. See Hoyle at col. 9, lines 30-35 and 62-64 (stating, inter alia, "the user can customize this toolbar either by dragging icons onto or off of the toolbar, or via a suitable command available under the 'Tools' menu item."). In addition, Hoyle discloses that the software application can be programmed to automatically add or remove icons from the toolbar when the icons are added or removed from the desktop. See Hoyle at col. 9, lines 65-67. Hoyle also discloses the ability of a user to manually add, to the bookmark category toolbar, links to web pages or category icons to organize sets of links. See Hoyle at col. 10, lines 1-18 (stating, inter alia, "additional links can be added by conventional drag and drop methods (i.e., dragging onto the bookmark category icons 80) or via menu commands."). Thus, Hoyle discloses adding a new icon to a toolbar based on manual user configuration of the toolbar itself, programmatically adding a new icon to a toolbar based on manual configuration of the computer's software desktop, or manual user configuration of a toolbar for links to web pages. As such, Hoyle does not disclose adding a new control element in response to a current web site being rendered to invoke, in response to a current web site being rendered, functionality related to functionality offered by that current web site, as recited by claim 1.

The Office action suggests that Hoyle discloses customizing the chrome with a control element that invokes functionality related to the destination web site through the use of a book mark to the current web page. See Office action of August 16, 2004 at page 22, lines 7-10. However, this is not sufficient to meet the present claim limitations, since the functionality invoked through selection of a book mark is not related to the functionality of the web site being book marked.

With regard to Alexa, the Examiner agrees that Alexa does not teach adding a control element to the chrome displayed. See Office Action of August 16, 2004 at page 28. As such, Alexa cannot cure Bertram's failure to describe or suggest chrome being displayed by a chrome display program that adds a control element configured to invoke functionality related to the

functionality offered by the current web site being rendered to the chrome displayed while maintaining at least one element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new control element, as recited in claim 1.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1 because neither Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, nor any combination of the references describes or suggests a web browser program configured to supplement chrome in response to a current web site being rendered with a control element that is configured to invoke functionality related to functionality offered by the current web site being rendered while maintaining at least one element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new element.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle, Alexa and Miller, "An Introduction to the Resource Description Framework," D-Lib Magazine, May 1998, pages 1-12 (hereinafter, "Miller"); claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle, Alexa and Peyer (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,401); claims 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle, Alexa and Brown, et al. "Using Netscape 2" published by Que Corporation 1995, page 74 (hereinafter, "Brown"). Neither do any of these references remedy the failure of Alexa, Hoyle, and Bertram, alone or in combination, to describe or suggest the subject matter of amended claim 1.

Therefore, neither Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, Miller, Peyer, Brown nor any combination of the references describe or suggest the subject matter of amended claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2, 4, and 5-7, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1.

Claim 14 is directed to a web browser that, inter alia, displays chrome such that the chrome is based on a chrome specifier corresponding to the current web site being rendered when a chrome specifier is associated with functionality offered by the current web site and such that the chrome returns to a default chrome when a chrome specifier is not associated with the functionality offered by the current web site.

As described above, Bertram, Alexa, or Hoyle, alone or in combination, do not describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 14. For at least this reason, Applicant requests allowance of claim 14 and claim 19 which depends on claim 14.

Independent claim 20 is directed to a web browser program that, inter alia, modifies less than all of the control elements on the chrome and at least one of the modified control elements is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being rendered. As described previously with respect to claim 1, Bertram replaces all of the control elements. Thus, Bertram does not disclose modifying less than all of the control elements on the chrome. Alexa discloses displaying advertisements, as described above. As such, Alexa does not disclose modifying less than all of the control elements on the chrome, as recited in claim 20.

Therefore, neither Bertram, Alexa, Hoyle, nor the combination of the references describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 20. For at least this reason, applicant requests the rejection of claim 20 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner also rejects claim 15 as being unpatentable over “Ad on the Bar Campaign Supplements Alexa’s Focused Advertising Program,”

http://www.alexa.com/press/press_releases/ad.html, pages 1-3, published 12/10/1997

(hereinafter, “Alexa 2”). Alexa 2 discloses the display of advertisements on a toolbar. As such, Alexa 2 does not remedy the failure of Alexa and Bertram to describe or suggest the subject matter of amended claim 1 from which claim 15 depends.

Claim 15 is directed to a feature of the web browser program recited in claim 1 from which claim 15 depends. More particularly, claim 15 recites the chrome corresponding to the chrome specifiers of the current web site being rendered and displayed by the chrome display program adds a new control element to the chrome displayed based on past web sites rendered by the client computer while maintaining at least one element of the chrome displayed prior to the addition of the new control element. For at least these reasons and the reasons described above with respect to amended claim 1, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 15.

Rejection of Claims 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Independent claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle. Claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bertram and Hoyle in further view of Alexa.

Claim 21 is directed to a computer-implemented method for reconfiguring chrome of a user interface to a web browser program and recites, inter alia, adding a new control element to the chrome being displayed while maintaining at least one element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new control element. The new control element is configured in response to the current web site being rendered to invoke functionality related to functionality offered by the current web site being rendered (emphasis added).

As discussed above with respect to amended claim 1, neither Bertram, Hoyle, nor any combination of the two references describes or suggests a new control element that is configured in response to the current web site being rendered to invoke functionality related to functionality offered by the current web site being rendered. Also as described above, Alexa does not remedy this failure.

Because Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa or any combination of the references do not describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 21, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21. Applicant submits that claims 22-24 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence on claim 21.

Rejection of Claims 13, 18 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle and Alexa as applied to claim 1 and in further view of Hetherington (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,515).

Amended claim 13 recites a web browser that, inter alia, displays chrome that includes words that are based on a stored language demographic associated with the user.

As neither Bertram, Alexa, Hoyle, Hetherington or any combination of the references describes or suggests this feature, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 13.

Bertram substitutes, for “a normal adult or parent browser user interface,” a new user interface that includes animal graphics. See Bertram at col. 10, lines 1-19. In contrast, claim 13 recites a chrome that includes words that are based a language demographic of the user. The animal graphics in Bertram do not include or otherwise suggest words. Thus, the animal graphic in Bertram is distinguishable from a chrome that includes words that are based on a stored

language demographic of the user, as recited by claim 13. Neither Hoyle nor Alexa remedies this failure of Bertram. Therefore, neither Bertram, Alexa, nor the combination of the two describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 13.

Hetherington discloses dynamically linking, at runtime, language-specific files containing user interface text during the initialization of an application or when a language change request is received. See Hetherington at Abstract. Hetherington discloses “allow[ing] users to change user interface display languages on the fly, and permits multiple users of an application to change the display language.” See Hetherington at col. 4, lines 32-35. Thus, Hetherington discloses dynamically changing the language used to display text of a user interface under manual user control, not based on a stored language demographic of a user, as recited in claim 13.

The Office action states that “Bertram automatically switch[es a] user interface to another user interface corresponding to the language demographic of the user such as graphic language for [a] preschool child.” See Office action of August 16, 2004 at page 28. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 13 recites a web browser that, inter alia, displays chrome that includes words based on a stored language demographic of the user. The graphics of Bertram simply do not involve the use of “words” on chrome for a child, as unambiguously recited in claim 13. See Bertram Figure 2 (showing chrome that includes only pictures). Nor does Bertram provide any suggestion for the use of words or a stored language demographic.

With regard to Hetherington, the Office action states that “Hetherington teaches dynamically chang[ing a] user interface based on a stored language content property of the user” and citing Figure 2A and a portion of column 5 that describes Figure 2A. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Hetherington states:

Referring back to FIG. 2A, operating system 202 may include a language or “regional setting” property or variable 214 as shown. Property 214 may contain either an uppercase, two letter ISO Country Code as defined by ISO-3166 or a lower-case, two letter ISO Language Code as defined by ISO-639, or both. User interface text files 208 may be selected based on the content of property 214. Changing property 214 may cause user interface components registered as subscribers for language change request notification to reload with different human-language text drawn from a different UI text storage object 208, dynamically changing the UI display language.

Hetherington at col. 5, lines 1-12 (emphasis added).

Thus, according to the plain text of Hetherington, a language variable is associated with the operating system and is not associated with a user. Hence, Hetherington does not describe or suggest a stored language demographic associated with a user, and necessarily cannot disclose displaying chrome based on chrome specifiers and displayed by the chrome display program that includes words that are based on a stored language demographic of the user, as recited in amended claim 13.

Thus, neither Bertram, Hetherington nor a combination of the references displays chrome based on chrome specifiers and displayed by the chrome display program that includes words that are based on a stored language demographic of the user, as recited in claim 13. For at least these reasons, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 and claims 18 and 25-27 that depend on claim 13.

New claims 28-43 depend, directly or indirectly, from amended independent claim 1, 14, 20 or 21, respectively. Applicant submits that claims 28-43 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence on claims 1, 14, 20 or 21, respectively.

New independent claim 44 is directed to a method for partially customizing chrome displayed as part of a user interface by adding a control element configured to enable selection of new functionality that is related to a current web resource being accessed. The method includes, inter alia, presenting, in addition to at least some of the set of selectable chrome elements, an additional selectable chrome element that is related to functionality offered by the web resource being accessed. As described previously, none of Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, Miller, Brown, Hetherington, or Alexa 2, or any combination of the references describes or suggests presenting, in addition to at least some of the set of selectable chrome elements, an additional selectable chrome element that is related to functionality offered by the web resource being accessed. For at least this reason, applicant requests allowance of new claim 44 and new claims 45-48 that depend from new claim 44.

Applicants asks that all claims be allowed.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or

Applicant : David HYATT et al.
Serial No. : 09/208,805
Filed : December 9, 1998
Page : 20 of 20


Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-188001 / Browser 05

other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Enclosed is a check for \$1186.00 for the Request for Continued Examination fee (\$790.00) and dependent claims (\$396.00). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 5, 2004



Barbara A. Benoit
Reg. No. 54,777

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331